

Message Text

PAGE 01 NATO 01626 01 OF 02 242000Z

63

ACTION ACDA-10

INFO OCT-01 EUR-12 ISO-00 ERDA-05 CIAE-00 H-02 INR-07

IO-10 L-02 NSAE-00 OIC-02 OMB-01 PA-01 PM-03 PRS-01

SAJ-01 SAM-01 SP-02 SS-15 USIA-06 TRSE-00 NSC-05

BIB-01 /088 W

----- 077759

R 241742Z MAR 75

FM USMISSION NATO

TO SECSTATE WASHDC 807

SECDEF WASHDC

INFO USDEL MBFR VIENNA

AMEMBASSY ATHENS

AMEMBASSY BONN

AMEMBASSY COPENHAGEN

AMEMBASSY LONDON

AMEMBASSY OSLO

AMEMBASSY ROME

AMEMBASSY ANKARA

USNMR SHAPE

USCINCEUR

S E C R E T SECTION 1 OF 2 USNATO 1626

E.O. 11652: GDS

TAGS: PARM, NATO

SUBJ: MBFR: FLANK SECURITY: SPC MEETING MARCH 20

REF: A) USNATO 5200 DTG 242030Z SEP 74 (NOTAL); B) USNATO 1363

DTG 121210Z MAR 75 (NOTAL); C) STATE 175188 DTG AUG 74

(NOTAL; D) STATE 221663 DTG OCT 74 (NOTAL); E) STATE 51679

(NOTAL; F) STATE 62411

SUMMARY: SPC ON MARCH 20, AT TURKISH REQUEST, HELD FIRST MEETING
ON GUIDANCE TO AHG ON FLANK SECURITY SINCE SEPTEMBER, WHEN THE
IMPASSE HAD DEVELOPED ON LANGUAGE DESCRIBING THE GEOGRAPHIC REGIONS
WHERE U.S. AND SOVIET FORCES WITHDRAWN FROM NGA WOULD NOT REDEPLOY.

SECRET

PAGE 02 NATO 01626 01 OF 02 242000Z

THERE WAS FURTHER MOVEMENT TOWARD THE GENERAL BELGIAN FORMULATION
ON THIS POINT. BELGIUM, U.S., NETHERLANDS AND CANADA REAFFIRMED
THEIR SUPPORT FOR THE BELGIAN FORMULATION. DENMARK MADE ITS PRE-
FERENCE FOR BELGIAN FORMULATION CLEARER, AND NORWAY FOR FIRST

TIME SUPPORTED IT.

MC REP FOR FIRST TIME STATED A MILITARY PREFERENCE FOR IT.

TURKISH REP AGAIN STATED HIS ABILITY TO SUPPORT BELGIAN FORMULATION IN INTEREST OF SPC CONSENSUS, AND QUESTIONED ITALIAN REP ON WHY THE LATTER SO STRONGLY SUPPORTED THE ITALIAN FORMULATION, WHICH MORE PRECISELY DEFINES THE GEOGRAPHIC AREAS WHERE WITHDRAWN FORCES WOULD NOT REDEPLOY. ITALY, GREECE AND UK REAFFIRMED THEIR SUPPORT FOR ITALIAN FORMULATION. FRG, WHICH HAD PREVIOUSLY SUPPORTED ITALIAN FORMULATION; DID NOT STATE A PREFERENCE AT THIS MEETING. END SUMMARY:

1. ACTING CHAIRMAN (KILLHAM) BEGAN THE MEETING BY NOTING THAT THE PRESENT SPC DRAFT GUIDANCE ON FLANK SECURITY (REF A, PARA 2, AS AMENDED BY REF B, PARA 8) HAD NARROWED THE DIFFERENCES DOWN TO ONLY TWO BRACKETED SECTIONS, AND HE URGED SPC MEMBERS NOT TO REOPEN PARTS OF THE GUIDANCE WHICH HAD BEEN AGREED UPON LAST SEPTEMBER.

2. ITALIAN REP (SPINELLI) CONFIRMED THAT ITALY STILL SUPPORTS THE SECOND BRACKETED (ITALIAN) ALTERNATIVE PHRASE IN PARA 2 OF THE DRAFT GUIDANCE, WHICH WOULD PROHIBIT MOVEMENT OF U.S. AND SOVIET FORCES WITHDRAWN FROM THE NGA TO AREAS CONTIGUOUS EITHER TO THE NGA OR TO THE TERRITORY OF SPECIAL PARTICIPANTS. TURKISH REP (GUR) REITERATED HIS ABILITY TO ACCEPT THE MORE GENERAL BELGIAN FORMULATION (FIRST BRACKETED ALTERNATIVE IN THE DRAFT GUIDANCE), AND ASKED WHY THE ITALIAN REP HELD SO STRONGLY TO HIS AMENDMENT. ITALIAN REP REPLIED THAT ITALIAN FORMULATION WOULD RESOLVE THREE PROBLEMS; FLANK SECURITY, GENERAL NON-CIRCUMVENTION, AND HUNGARY. IT WOULD ESTABLISH A SUFFICIENTLY PRECISE STANDARD WHICH WOULD NOT RAISE THE COMPLICATIONS OF A FORMULATION WHICH WAS TOO VAGUE. TURKISH REP SAID ALLIES WILL EVENTUALLY WORK ON A GENERAL NON-CIRCUMVENTION CLAUSE. RE HUNGARY, HE SAID ITALY IS TRYING TO INCLUDE HUNGARY IN A WAY WHICH WOULD EXCLUDE ITALY. THE OTHER SIDE IS AS INTELLIGENT AS THE ALLIES, AND WILL POINT THIS OUT.

3. NETHERLANDS REP (BUWALDA) SAID ITALIAN FORMULATION LACKS SECRET

PAGE 03 NATO 01626 01 OF 02 242000Z

THE POSSIBILITY OF DEFENDING IT WITH THE OTHER SIDE. THERE IS NOT THE SLIGHTEST CHANCE THE OTHER SIDE WILL ACCEPT IT. NETHERLANDS CONTINUES TO SUPPORT THE BELGIAN FORMULATION AND TO OPPOSE THE ITALIAN FORMULATION.

4. FRG REP (HOYNCK) ASKED FOR COMMENT ON WHETHER THE ITALIAN FORMULATION HAD ANY FAULTS OTHER THAN NON-NEGOTIABILITY.

5. CANADIAN REP (BARTLEMAN) SAID CANADA CONTINUES TO SUPPORT BELGIAN FORMULATION, AND TO CONSIDER U.S. ARGUMENTS OF SIX MONTHS AGO QUITE VALID. HE NOTED THAT THE RECIPROCITY THE ALLIES WOULD HAVE TO GIVE SOVIETS FOR ITALIAN FORMULATION WOULD INHIBIT REINFORCEMENT IN TIMES OF CRISIS.

6. U.S. REP (MOORE) CONFIRMED CONTINUED U.S. SUPPORT FOR BELGIAN FORMULATION. HE AGREED WITH NETHERLANDS REP THAT ITALIAN FORMULATION WOULD BE VERY DIFFICULT TO NEGOTIATE, AND MAY BE NON-NEGOTIABLE. HOWEVER, EVEN IF IT WERE NEGOTIABLE, IT WOULD BE A BAD THING FOR THE ALLIES. THE ITALIAN FORMULATION INVOLVES SPECIFIC CONSTRAINTS ON MOVEMENTS OF SOVIET FORCES IN SOVIET TERRITORY. THIS RAISES THE DANGER OF RECIPROCAL LIMITATIONS ON MOVEMENTS OF ALLIED FORCES OUTSIDE THE NGA, WHICH WOULD BROADEN THE GEOGRAPHIC FOCUS OF THE NEGOTIATION, AND WHICH, ACCORDING TO THE MBFR WORKING GROUP REPORT (AC/276-D(74)2, APR 25, 1974 WOULD NOT BE TOLERABLE FOR NATO. THE BELGIAN FORMULATION PROVIDES AN ADEQUATE STANDARD FOR SAFEGUARDING SECURITY OF THE FLANKS WITHOUT RESTRICTING ALLIED FLEXIBILITY.

7. DANISH REP (VILLADSEN) STATED THAT DENMARK COULD FOLLOW THE MAJORITY, BUT FAVORS THE BELGIAN FORMULATION.

8. NORWEGIAN REP (SELMER) STATED NORWAY HAS UTMOST FLEXIBILITY ON THIS ISSUE, BUT FAVORS BELGIAN FORMULATION.

9. UK REP (SINTON) AND GREEK REP (RAFAEL) SAID THAT THEIR GOVERNMENTS CONTINUE TO SUPPORT ITALIAN FORMULATION.

SECRET

PAGE 01 NATO 01626 02 OF 02 242028Z

63

ACTION ACDA-10

INFO OCT-01 EUR-12 ISO-00 ERDA-05 CIAE-00 H-02 INR-07

IO-10 L-02 NSAE-00 OIC-02 OMB-01 PA-01 PM-03 PRS-01

SAJ-01 SAM-01 SP-02 SS-15 USIA-06 TRSE-00 NSC-05

BIB-01 /088 W

----- 078116

R 241742Z MAR 75

FM USMISSION NATO

TO SECSTATE WASHDC 808

SECDEF WASHDC

INFO USDEL MBFR VIENNA

AMEMBASSY ATHENS

AMEMBASSY BONN

AMEMBASSY COPENHAGEN

AMEMBASSY LONDON

AMEMBASSY OSLO

AMEMBASSY ROME

AMEMBASSY ANKARA

USNMR SHAPE

USCINCEUR

S E C R E T SECTION 2 OF 2 USNATO 1626

10. TURKISH REP SAID (IN A REMARK OBVIOUSLY DIRECTED AT ITALIAN REP) THAT IF THERE WERE NO GUIDANCE ON FLANK SECURITY, HE WOULD OPPOSE ANY STUDY OF MEASURES TO RESOLVE THE PROBLEM OF HUNGARY.

11. MC REP (GROUP CAPTAIN SMITH) STATED A MILITARY PREFERENCE FOR THE BELGIAN FORMULATION, BECAUSE OF THE PROBLEM OF RECIPROCITY INVOLVED IN THE ITALIAN FORMULATION, WHICH COULD LEAD TO UNACCEPTABLE CONSTRAINTS ON ALLIED FORCES OUTSIDE THE NGA. HE EXPRESSED CONCERN THAT UNDER THE ITALIAN FORMULATION, THE ALLIES MIGHT NOT BE ABLE TO RESIST PUBLIC PRESSURE TO AGREE TO CONSTRAINTS ON ALLIED FORCES OUTSIDE NGA.

12. RE THE OTHER POINT AT ISSUE IN THE SPC DRAFT GUIDANCE, ON
SECRET

PAGE 02 NATO 01626 02 OF 02 242028Z

WHETHER AHG OR COUNCIL WILL DETERMINE TIMING OF USE OF THIS GUIDANCE WITH THE OTHER SIDE (PARA 3 D OF THE DRAFT GUIDANCE), NETHERLANDS REP MAINTAINED DUTCH SUPPORT FOR THE SECOND BRACKETED PHRASE MAKING THIS A MATTER FOR COUNCIL DECISION. DANISH REP SAID HE COULD ACCEPT THIS, AND DID NOT CONSIDER IT HARMFUL. BELGIAN REP (NRUNY) SAID BELGIUM PREFERRED FIRST BRACKETED PHRASE, LEAVING THE TIMING UP TO AHG, BUT COULD RALLY TO THE DUTCH PHRASE IF NECESSARY TO REACH A CONSENSUS.

13. NEXT SPC CONSIDERATION OF FLANK SECURITY SCHEDULED FOR TUESDAY, MARCH 25.

14. COMMENT: WASHINGTON'S CURRENT INSTRUCTIONS ON SPC DRAFT GUIDANCE ARE CONTAINED IN REFS C AND D, AS CONFIRMED BY REFS E AND F. REF C AUTHORIZED MISSION TO SUPPORT TO SPC DRAFT GUIDANCE WITH BELGIAN LANGUAGE ON GEOGRAPHIC AREAS, AND MISSION HAS DONE SO. PRESENT SPC DRAFT GUIDANCE COMPLIES WITH THAT INSTRUCTIONS, WITH U.S. OPPOSING BRACKETED ITALIAN LANGUAGE ON GEOGRAPHIC AREAS, AND BRACKETED DUTCH LANGUAGE REQUIRING COUNCIL DECISION ON TIMING OF AHG USE OF GUIDANCE.

15. AS WASHINGTON IS AWARE, MISSION RECEIVED REF D AFTER SPC HAD SET ASIDE FLANK SECURITY IN SEPTEMBER, DUE TO IMPASSE AND NEED TO WORK ON OTHER ISSUES. REF D SAID THAT IF MISSION BELIEVED IT COULD SO WITHOUT RAISING ISSUE OF PRINCIPLE, IT SHOULD SEEK AMENDMENT OF SECOND SENTENCE OF PARA 2 OF DRAFT GUIDANCE RE NAC APPROVAL OF TREATY LANGUAGE TEXT. MISSION BELIEVES THIS COURSE WOULD RAISE ISSUE OF PRINCIPLE, AND WOULD ALSO ENCOURAGE OTHER COUNTRIES TO RE-OPEN OTHER PARTS OF THE DRAFT GUIDANCE, AND SO IN ACCORDANCE WITH REF D WE DO NOT INTEND TO RAISE THIS QUESTION. MISSION PLANS TO INDICATE ORALLY IN SPC THAT NOTHING IN THIS DRAFT GUIDANCE PREJUDICES LATER ALLIED WORK ON THE FORM OF THE COMMITMENT AND RELATED ISSUES.

16. REF D ALSO NOTED THE FOOTNOTE TO PARA 2 WHICH STATES VIEWS OF SOME DELEGATIONS ON HOW TO SPECIFY GEOGRAPHIC AREAS, AND REQUESTED THE INSERTION OF ANOTHER FOOTNOTE REFLECTING U.S. VIEWS OF UNDESIRABILITY OF SPECIFYING GEOGRAPHIC AREAS. THE FOOTNOTE ON WAYS TO SPECIFY GEOGRAPHIC AREAS MAY FALL AWAY IF SPC CAN AGREE TO THE GENERAL BELGIAN LANGUAGE ON GEOGRAPHIC AREAS. IF
SECRET

PAGE 03 NATO 01626 02 OF 02 242028Z

THIS IS NOT THE CASE, MISSION WILL OBTAIN INSERTION OF THE U.S. FOOTNOTE.

17. REF D ALSO INDICATED PREFERENCE FOR BELGIAN LANGUAGE IN PARA 3 D OF DRAFT GUIDANCE, I.E., LEAVING TO THE AHG THE TIMING OF USE OF THE GUIDANCE WITH THE OTHER SIDE, RATHER THAN THE DUTCH PHRASE MAKING TIMING A NAC DECISION. THE ORIGIN OF THE LATTER PHRASE IS THAT THE DUTCH LAST FALL DID NOT WANT EARLY AHG USE OF GUIDANCE ON FLANK SECURITY BECAUSE, AS THEY STATED IN SPC, THIS MIGHT DOWNGRADE WITH THE EAST THE IMPORTANCE OF GENERAL NON-CIRCUMVENTION, AND BECAUSE, AS THEY TOLD US PRIVATELY, IT WOULD BE RIDICULOUS TO DISCUSS FLANK SECURITY WITH THE EAST AT A TIME WHEN THE FLANK COUNTRIES WERE THREATENING EACH OTHER'S SECURITY. MISSION CONVERSATIONS WITH DUTCH DELEGATION OFFICER LEADS US TO THINK DUTCH POSITION ON THIS ISSUE IS SOFTENING, AND DUTCH MAY COME AROUND TO LEAVE TIMING QUESTION TO AHG.
END COMMENT. BRUCE

SECRET

<< END OF DOCUMENT >>

Message Attributes

Automatic Decaptioning: X
Capture Date: 18 AUG 1999
Channel Indicators: n/a
Current Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Concepts: n/a
Control Number: n/a
Copy: SINGLE
Draft Date: 24 MAR 1975
Decaption Date: 01 JAN 1960
Decaption Note:
Disposition Action: RELEASED
Disposition Approved on Date:
Disposition Authority: ellisoob
Disposition Case Number: n/a
Disposition Comment: 25 YEAR REVIEW
Disposition Date: 28 MAY 2004
Disposition Event:
Disposition History: n/a
Disposition Reason:
Disposition Remarks:
Document Number: 1975NATO01626
Document Source: ADS
Document Unique ID: 00
Drafter: n/a
Enclosure: n/a
Executive Order: 11652 GDS
Errors: n/a
Film Number: n/a
From: NATO
Handling Restrictions: n/a
Image Path:
ISecure: 1
Legacy Key: link1975/newtext/t19750398/abbrziyj.tel
Line Count: 247
Locator: TEXT ON-LINE
Office: n/a
Original Classification: SECRET
Original Handling Restrictions: n/a
Original Previous Classification: n/a
Original Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Page Count: 5
Previous Channel Indicators:
Previous Classification: SECRET
Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Reference: A) USNATO 5200 DTG 242030Z SEP 74 (NOTAL); B) USNATO 1363 DTG 121210Z MAR 75 (NOTAL); C) STATE 175188 DTG AUG 74 (NOTAL); D) STATE 221663 DTG OCT 74 (NOTAL); E) STATE 51679 (NOTAL); F) STATE 62411
Review Action: RELEASED, APPROVED
Review Authority: ellisoob
Review Comment: n/a
Review Content Flags:
Review Date: 07 APR 2003
Review Event:
Review Exemptions: n/a
Review History: RELEASED <07 APR 2003 by KelleyW0>; APPROVED <22 SEP 2003 by ellisoob>
Review Markings:

Margaret P. Grafeld
Declassified/Released
US Department of State
EO Systematic Review
05 JUL 2006

Review Media Identifier:
Review Referrals: n/a
Review Release Date: n/a
Review Release Event: n/a
Review Transfer Date:
Review Withdrawn Fields: n/a
Secure: OPEN
Status: NATIVE
Subject: MBFR: FLANK SECURITY: SPC MEETING MARCH 20
TAGS: PARM, NATO
To: STATE
SECDEF INFO MBFR VIENNA
ATHENS
BONN
COPENHAGEN

LONDON
OSLO
ROME
ANKARA
USNMR SHAPE
USCINCEUR

Type: TE

Markings: Margaret P. Grafeld Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 05 JUL 2006